

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

			·		
APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,271	10/037,271 11/07/2001		Scott W. Huffer	9325-58 (153520)	7750
35811	7590	04/03/2006		EXAMINER	
IP GROUP		PIPER RUDNICI	YAN, REN LUO		
SUITE 4900			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELI	PHIA, PA	19103	2854		

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			~			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/037,271	HUFFER, SCOTT W.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	Th. 11411 100 DATE 411	Ren L. Yan	2854			
Period fo	 The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply 	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 D	December 2005.				
		s action is non-final.				
3)□	, -					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□	Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the at 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the	epted or b) objected to by the				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat crity documents have been receiv	ion No			
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	∍d.			
Attachmen	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)			
2) Notice No	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D				

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12-5-2005 has been entered.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2854

Claims 1-7 and 10-14 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,872 in view of Kawahata et al(5,019,202).

Claims 1-11 of the patent teaches the exact printing process as claimed including all of the steps as recited except for the coating being cured by electron beam processing. Kawahata et al teach in a similar printing process the conventional use of electron beam process to cure a coating. See the paragraph bridging columns 11 and 12 in Kawahata et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the printing process in claims 1-11 of the patent with the electron beam process as taught by Kawahata et al in order to more effectively cure the coating layer so as to obtain a desired appearance of the printed product.

Claims 1-7 and 10-14 would be allowed if the above obviousness double patenting rejection was overcome in applicant's next response to this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ren L Yan

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan

March 30, 2006